



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,176	09/830,176 04/23/2001		Joseph P. Dougherty	13257-00040	2969
46046	7590	90 09/19/2005 EXAMINER			
	TYRRELL P	WOITACI	WOITACH, JOSEPH T		
66 EAST MAIN STREET MARLTON, NJ 08053				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MAKETON,	143 06033			1632	
			DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
09/830,176	DOUGHERTY ET AL.	DOUGHERTY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Joseph T. Woitach	1632		

Defense the Fillian of an Annual Duick							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
:	Joseph T. Woitach	1632					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 06 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
	eriod for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com- of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS 	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brio	f will not be entered t	haaayaa				
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);					
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	iected claims					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	-	jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	• • •	omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		omphant / unenament	(1 102 024).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	nent canceling				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>7 and 8</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(nils to provide a (1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					
13. Other:	, ,	· · · · ·					
: :		γ	=47				
	,	, ,					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The addition of new limitations drawn to "lipopolysaccharide-stimulated" and "deficient of T-cells" requires a new search and consideration of therelevant art. Further, Applicants have not pointed to support in the instant specification for the new amendments and consideration of new matter for the particular combination is required. Finally, the metes and bounds of the claim regarding the limitation of "deficient of T-cells" would have to evaluated because it is not clear if this is a component of the claimed composition or a functional aspect of the claimed myeloid committed stem cell..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments rely on claim amendments that have not been entered. To the extent the arguments apply to the pending claims, again it does not appear from the teachings in the instant specification that the source from which the cells are obtained materially affect the claimed myeloid committed stem cell as broadly claimed. The rejections are maintained for the reasons of record.